

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN**

---

**MICHAEL C. HENDERSON,**

**Plaintiff,**

**v.**

**Case No. 22-CV-558**

**CHRISTOPHER VERTZ,**

**Defendant.**

---

**ORDER**

---

On April 19, 2024, the court granted the defendant's motion for judgment on the pleadings and dismissed *pro se* plaintiff Michael C. Henderson's case because it was barred by *Heck v. Humphrey*, 512 U.S. 486 (1994). (ECF No. 40.) On May 17, 2024, Henderson filed a motion asking the court to reconsider its order. (ECF No. 46.) Henderson argues that the court did not consider that he wanted the evidence that was withheld not to challenge his criminal conviction but to bring a claim of ineffective assistance of counsel. (*Id.* at 2.) However, in its decision, the court directly addressed this contention, pointing out that the allegations in his second amended complaint stated that he wanted to use the evidence to bring an ineffective assistance of counsel claim, but he also wanted the evidence to use as exculpatory evidence in his underlying state criminal case. (ECF No. 40 at 2-3.) The court is required to contain its analysis to the four corners of the second amended complaint. *Jones v. Bock*, 549 U.S. 199, 215 (2005).

In short, Henderson is taking issue with the way the court applied the law to his allegations. This is not a basis for granting a motion for reconsideration. *See Oto v. Metropolitan Life Ins. Co.*, 244 F.3d 601, 606 (7th Cir. 2000) (holding that a motion that “merely took umbrage with the court’s ruling and rehashed arguments” was properly rejected by the district court).

**IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that Henderson’s motion for reconsideration (ECF No. 46) is **DENIED**.

Dated in Milwaukee, Wisconsin this 17th day of July, 2024.



STEPHEN DRIES  
United States Magistrate Judge